In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1913

GEORGE W. BEATTIE, APPELLANT,

v.

WILLIAM HUNTER, UNITED STATES MARSHAL, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK. | No. 635.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

MOTION TO ADVANCE.

In the Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1903.

GEORGE W. BEAVERS, APPELLANT,
v.
WILLIAM HENKEL, UNITED STATES marshal, southern district of New York. } No. 535.

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

MOTION TO ADVANCE.

The appellant was indicted on July 22, 1903, in the circuit court of the United States for the eastern district of New York, for having, on July 25, 1900, received compensation, that is to say a check for $8.10 (said Beavers being then and there an officer in the employ of the United States), from the Edward J. Brandt-Dent Company in payment for his services in procuring a contract with the United States for the purchase of 250 Brandt automatic cashiers, in violation of section 1781 of the Revised Statutes. Upon a warrant issued by Samuel H. Hitchcock, United States commissioner

16979—04

in the southern district of New York, the defendant was arrested in New York City in that district. He sued out a writ of habeas corpus to test the right to remove him to the eastern district of New York for trial on said indictment, claiming that the process on which he was held was void, and that he was restrained of his liberty in violation of the Constitution of the United States. On hearing the writ was discharged, the appellant admitted to bail in the sum of $5,000, and this appeal taken.

As the case is one of several prosecutions that are known as the Post-Office frauds, and of general public interest, and in order that a prompt trial on the merits may be had, if possible, the Solicitor-General, on behalf of the United States, moves the court, under rule 26, section 3, to advance the case on the docket for hearing during the present term.

If agreeable to the court, the Solicitor-General suggests that the case be set down for hearing early in March next.

Notice of this motion has been served upon counsel for the appellant.

HENRY M. HOYT,
Solicitor-General.

O